

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 19-21, 28-38 are pending.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Claims 21 and 29 stand rejected because of insufficient antecedent basis. Accordingly, claims 21 and 29 have been amended to overcome the present rejection.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 19-20, 28-30, and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent no. 6,405,037 of *Rossmann et al.* ("*Rossmann*"). Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejection.

Rossmann discloses a method and architecture for an interactive two-way data communication network. The "two-way data communication device" in *Rossmann* "utilizes a client module to transmit message including a resource selector chosen by the user to a server on a server computer on the computer network. The server processes the message and transmits a response over the two-way data communication network to the client module. The client module interprets the response and presents the response to the user via a structured user interface." *Rossmann*, Abstract.

In contrast, Claim 19 recites in part "a processor, coupled to the memory and the display screen, to execute the code in the memory to cause the apparatus to: initiate a request to the server over the wireless network for the phone bookmark in the server, wherein the phone bookmark can be updated by a web client device coupled to the

landnet; display the phone bookmark on the display screen after receiving the phone bookmark from the server; extract a phone number associated with a name from the phone bookmark when the name is selected; and dial the phone number automatically to initiate a phone communication in response to a predetermined user input.”

Rossman is silent as to “a phone bookmark” stored in a server. In one embodiment, *Rossman* teaches that “client module 702 can also support local services on cellular telephone 700. Typical local services include local messages, **an address book**, and preconfigured e-mail replies, or any combination of such services.” Applicant submits that an address book is different than a phone bookmark. Further, the **local** address book on cellular telephone 700 is clearly **not** stored in the server. Thus, *Rossman* does not teach or suggest “a phone bookmark” or a phone bookmark in the server.

Furthermore, *Rossman* is silent as to “extract a phone number associated with a name from the phone bookmark when the name is selected”. The paragraphs cited in the Final Office Action relate to “retrieve data process” 852 and 1302. For example, “client module 702 retrieves the information stored at the location indicated by the identifier from working memory 716 and processes the information.” *Rossman*, Col. 31, lines 37-39. The retrieval of information does not suggest “extract a phone number associated with a name from the phone bookmark when the name is selected”.

Therefore, Applicant submits that *Rossman* does not teach or suggest the limitations recited in the present pending claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the present rejection be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner is thanked for allowing Claims 21, 31-32 and 37-38 is rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.


Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: March 15, 2007



Thierry Lo
Reg. No. 49,097

Customer No. 26529
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300